

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY JR.

## Dulles Often Unkind to Capitalism

During the last years of his life Allen Dulles was under relentless attack as the symbol of James Bond diplomacy, so gruesomely inappropriate, it is held, to the realities of modern politics, to such higher sophistication as makes heroes out of traitors, gods out of Kim Philby and the Rosenbergs.

Ramparts Magazine — it would be heartening to refer to the late Ramparts, except that it will no doubt be succeeded by something worse, the human imagination being capable nowadays of even that — made such reputation as it fleetingly had from exposing that the CIA under Dulles had done such outrageous things as subsidize Encounter Magazine in London, the National Students Association in the United States, and a training program at a midwestern university for area specialists headed for service in the CIA.

For all of this, obloquy for Dulles. I do believe that he'd have been better treated in his late years by some of the press if it had transpired that he had been in collusion with the Communists, in pursuit of detente.

All of this left Dulles on the defensive, and the general clamor subdued a criticism of his strategy which sounds faintly perverse, but which is naggingly relevant now that we have, once again, a Republican administration with critical decisions to make concern-

ing such issues as faced Dulles. True, there were those who make the whole right-centered criticism of Dulles awkward by such surrealisms as that Dulles was a Communist agent (yes, that is among the contributions of Mr. Robert Welch).

But the same voices from the right wondered not that Dulles was involved in subsidizing social-political movements and journals around the globe, but that he selected for patronage the left-minded organizations, on the assumption that only people who occupy a position contiguous to that of the people you worry about, are likely to be effective.

Thus in Italy you deal with the Social Democrats in preference to the Christian Democrats. Or, if you deal with the latter, you deal with that branch within it which tends left. Ditto elsewhere.

The analogies abound. You deal with liberal Republicans in America, in order to try to satisfy Democrats. Rockefeller yes, Goldwater no. When time comes to send around subsidies, you send them around to journals of opinion like the New Leader, not to those like the National Review. I know one person who did service in Mexico for the CIA who happens to believe profoundly that what would most benefit the Mexican people would be a stiff dose of capitalism, so as to free the

poor from the sclerosis of years and years of super-government.

He found himself a dozen years ago serving as a paymaster, with a wad of money in an envelope destined for an organization whose principal slogan was "Ni Comunismo, Ni Capitalismo," that is to say: neither Communism nor Capitalism — leaving: well, leaving what Mexico has got.

The reasoning, as I say, is psychologically obvious. The mischief of it lay in the hesitation of Dulles and his superiors to adopt radical strategy, radical strategy being the defense of conservative institutions and ideas on the altogether reassuring assumption that they would result in radical relief for the wretched of this world.

Shortly before he died, Henry Luce thought to formulate a similar position in addressing the National Council of Churches: Look (he intended to say) if you are genuinely concerned with the starving peoples of the world, which you no doubt, are, are you not obliged to investigate the apparent corollary between agricultural plenty and the free marketplace, as also agricultural privation and socialism? In other words, could you not, even in the name of Christianity, bring yourself to say a good word for capitalism?

During the Dulles years, conservatives starved to death. Precisely those people who reasoned that you could not deal with the Soviet Union, that the politics of detente were doomed to suffer such deaths as Dubcek suffered last summer. It was a period during which the resoluteness of our anti-communism was never in doubt, but a period during which the enemy gained vast continents, established themselves in power, developed their hydrogen bombs and missiles, and continued to hold us at missile-point.

It seems mean to observe at this point that Dulles should have been spared the criticisms of the Left, so as to expose himself to the criticisms of the Right. Let it be recorded, at least, that he sought to maneuver within the realpolitik of the postwar era, and that although he may have made bad strategic miscalculations, he was made to suffer at the hands of the wrong people. Because even if he did not know how finally to cope with the enemy, he knew at least who the enemy was, and that, these days, is practically a virtuoso performance.